Appl. No. 10/719,510 Reply Dated May 7, 2007

Reply to Office action of February 22, 2007

## REMARKS

Claims 1-42 stand rejected in this application under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being unpatentable over US 7.082,598 issued to Le et al. (hereinafter "Le").

Claims 1 and 22 have been amended to explicitly clarify that the peripheral device is not a hub in respect of an example embodiment. Claims 2 and 23 have been amended to be consistent with the amended claims. Support for this amendment can be found at page 3 line 17 and page 9 line 19 of the Applicant's specification.

In respect of an example embodiment, a signal is sent to the computer that identifies the peripheral device connected thereto as a hub even though the peripheral device is not, in fact, a hub. Le neither teaches nor suggests that a device connected to the computer can "pretend" that it is a hub by representing itself to the computer as such even though it is not actually a hub, in order, for example, to draw sufficient power from the computer that it would not otherwise get without having to develop and install a separate driver on the computer.

For example, in FIG. 9 and the accompanying description of Le, devices 941, 961, and 963 are depicted as USB devices, but Le does not teach or suggest that any of these devices, which are not hub devices, will nevertheless act to simulate a USB hub device in operation. Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not understand the peripheral device of Applicant's amended claims 1 and 22 to be one or more of Le's devices 941, 961 and 963. Furthermore, device 942 is depicted in Le as a hub device. However, since device 942 is, in fact, a hub device, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not understand the peripheral device of Applicant's amended claims 1 and 22 to be Le's device 942.

Appl. No. 10/719,510 Reply Dated May 7, 2007 Reply to Office action of February 22, 2007

Le does not teach all the recited elements of claims 1 and 22, and accordingly, of dependent claims 2-11 and 23-32 respectively. Withdrawal of the objections under 35 U.S.C. 102 is respectfully requested.

Reference is now made to claims 12 and 33. In respect of an example embodiment, a signal is sent to the computer that identifies the peripheral device connected thereto as a hub that has more than one device connected to it than is actually connected to it. Le neither teaches nor suggests that a device connected to the computer can "pretend" that it is a hub with an additional device connected to it than there actually is, in order, for example, to draw additional power from the computer that it would not otherwise get without having to develop and install a separate driver on the computer.

For example, in FIG. 9 and the accompanying description of Le, devices 941, 961, and 963 are depicted as USB devices, but Le does not teach or suggest that any of these devices, which are not hub devices, will act to simulate a USB hub device in operation. Furthermore, Le does not teach or suggest that any given device 941, 961, and 963 will communicate to the computer that it has some other peripheral device connect to 941, 961, and 963, when in actuality, there are no peripheral devices at all connected to that given device 941, 961, and 963. Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not understand the peripheral device of Applicant's claims 12 and 33 to be one or more of Le's devices 941, 961 and 963.

Similarly, device 942 is depicted in Le as a hub device, with two devices 961 and 962 attached thereto. However, Le does not teach or suggest that device 942 will communicate to the computer that it has three peripheral devices connected to it, when in actuality, there are only two peripheral devices connected to it. Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not

Appl. No. 10/719,510 Reply Dated May 7, 2007

Reply to Office action of February 22, 2007

understand the peripheral device of Applicant's claims 12 and 33 to be Le's device 942.

Le does not teach all the recited elements of claims 12 and 33, and accordingly, of dependent claims 13-21 and 34-42 respectively. Withdrawal of the objections under 35 U.S.C. 102 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing clarifications, Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-42 is in form for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted, Bereskin & Parr Agents for the Applicants

Ву

Kendrick Lo Reg. No. 54.948

(416) 364-7311